
A

SERMON

Concerning the
Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Christ.

Preached before the

QUEEN

At *WHITEHALL*, April 9. 1693.

A

SERMON

Concerning the

Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Christ, &c.

H E B. IX. 26.

*But now once hath he appeared
in the end of the world, to
take away sin by the sacrifice
of himself.*

Among many other great ends and reasons for which God was pleased to send his Son into the World to dwell amongst us, this was one of the chief, that by a long course of the greatest innocency and

and the greatest sufferings in our Nature he might be capable to make a perfect Expiation of Sin : *But now once in the end of the world, ὅτι σωτελεῖα τὸν αἰώνα, in the conclusion of the Ages, that is in the last Age of the World, which is the Gospel Age, hath he appeared to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself.*

The general design of God in sending his Son into the World was to save mankind from eternal death and misery, and to purchase for us eternal life and happiness. So the *Author* of our Salvation himself tells John 3. us, *That God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*

Now in order to the procuring of this Salvation for us, the impediments and hindrances of it were to be removed : these were the *guilt*, and the *dominion* of Sin : By the *guilt*

guilt of Sin we were become obnoxious to the wrath of God and to eternal condemnation, and by the *defilement* and *dominion* of it we were incapable of the happiness of Heaven and the reward of eternal Life.

To remove these two great hindrances two things were necessary: the Forgiveness of sins past, in order to our deliverance from the wrath of God and the eternal torments of the next Life; and the Reformation of our hearts and lives to make us capable of eternal Life and happiness in another World. And both these, if God had so pleased, might for any thing we certainly know to the contrary, have been effected by the abundant mercy and powerful grace of God, without this wonderful method and dispensation of sending his Son in our Nature to take away sin by the sacrifice of himself: But it seems the wisdom of

God thought fit to pitch upon this way and method of our Salvation, and no doubt for very good Reasons ; amongst which these *three* seem to be very obvious and very considerable.

First, to vindicate the honour of his Laws, which if Sin had gone altogether unpunish'd would have been in great danger of falling into contempt. For if God had proclaimed a general Pardon of Sin to all mankind, without any testimony of his wrath and displeasure against it, who would have had any great veneration for his Laws, or have believed in good earnest that the violation of them had been either so extremely offensive to Him, or so very dangerous to the Sinner ?

Therefore to maintain the honour of his Laws, rather than Sin should pass unpunish'd God would lay the punishment of it upon his only

only begotten Son, the dearest Person to him in the World : Which is a greater testimony of his high displeasure against Sin, and of his tender regard and concernment for the honour of his Laws, than if the Sinner had suffered the punishment due to it in his own person.

Secondly, another Reason of this Dispensation, and that likewise very considerable, was, that God might forgive Sin in such a way as yet effectually to discountenance and discourage it, and to create in us the greatest horror and hatred of it : Which could not have been by an absolute Pardon, without any punishment inflicted, or satisfaction made to the honour of his Justice. For had Sin been so easily forgiven, who would have been sensible of the great evil of it, or afraid to offend for the future ?

But when God makes his own Son a Sacrifice, and lays upon him the punishment due for the iniquities of us all, this is a demonstration that God hates Sin as much, if it be possible, as he loved his own Son. For this plainly shews what Sin deserves, and what the Sinner may justly expect, if after this severity of God against it he will venture to commit it.

And if this Sacrifice for Sin, and the Pardon purchased by it, be not effectual to reclaim us from Sin, and to beget in us an eternal dread and detestation of it : If we sin wilfully after so clear a revelation of the *wrath of God from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men*, there remains no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation to consume the adversaries. For what could God do more to testify his displeasure against

against sin, and to discountenance the practice of it, than to make his only Son an offering for Sin, and to give him up to be wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities? In what clearer Glass can we at once behold the great evil and demerit of Sin, and the infinite goodness and mercy of God to Sinners, than in the sorrows and sufferings of the Son of God for our Sins and for our sakes?

Thirdly, another Reason of this Dispensation seems to have been a gracious condescension and compliance of Almighty God with a certain apprehension and persuasion, which had very early and universally obtained among Mankind, concerning the expiation of Sin and appeasing the offended Deity by Sacrifices: by the Sacrifices of living Creatures, of Birds and Beasts; and afterwards by Human Sacrifices and *the blood of their*

their sons and daughters : by offering to God, as the expression is in the Prophet, *their first-born for their transgression, and the fruit of their body for the sin of their souls.*

And this Notion of the expiation of sin by Sacrifice, whether it had its first Rise from *Divine Revelation*, and was afterwards propagated from Age to Age by *Tradition* : I say, from whence soever this Notion came, it hath of all other Nations concerning Religion, excepting those of the *Being of God*, and his *Providence*, and of the *Recompences of another Life*, found the most universal reception, and the thing hath been the most generally practised in all Ages and Nations, not only in the *old*, but in the *new* discovered parts of the World.

And indeed a very great part of the *Jewish Religion*, which was instituted by God himself, seems to have

have been a plain condescension to the general Apprehension of Mankind, concerning this way of appeasing the offended Deity by Sacrifices: As it was also a Figure of that great and efficacious Sacrifice which should in due time be offer'd to God to make atonement once for all for the Sins of all Mankind.

And the *Apostle* to the *Hebrews* doth very particularly insist upon this condescension of God to them, in the Dispensation of the Gospel: and whereas they apprehended so great a necessity of an *High-Priest* and of *Sacrifices* to make expiation for the sins of the People, that it was an established *Principle* among them, that *without shedding of blood there was no remission of Sins*; God was pleased to comply so far with these *Notions* and *Apprehensions* of theirs, as to make his own Son both a *Priest* and a *Sacrifice*, to do that once for all

all which their own *High-Priest* pretended to do year by year.

And from hence the same *Apostle* takes occasion to recommend to them the *new Covenant and Dispensation of the Gospel*, as having a greater and more perfect *High-Priest* and a more excellent *Sacrifice*, than were the *High-Priests* and the *Sacrifices* under the *Law*; the *Son of God* having by one *Sacrifice of himself* obtained eternal *Redemption* for us, and perfected for ever them that are *sanctified*.

And this *Apprehension* prevailed no less in the *Heathen World*, and proceeded to the *Sacrifices of Men*, even of their *first born*. And with this *Apprehension*, not to countenance but to abolish it, God was pleased to comply so far as to make a general *Atonement* for the *Sins of Mankind* by the *Death of his Son*, appearing in our *Nature* to become a *voluntary Sacrifice* for us: God per-

permitting him to be unjustly put to death and his blood to be shed by the malice of men, in appearance as a Malefactor, but in truth as a Martyr; and accepting of his Death as a meritorious Sacrifice and *propitiation for the Sins of the whole World*: That by this wise counsel and permission of his Providence he might for ever put an end to that barbarous and inhuman way of serving God which had been so long in use and practice among them: The Son of God by the voluntary Sacrifice of himself having effected all that at once, and for ever, which Mankind from the beginning of the World had in vain been endeavouring to accomplish by innumerable and continual Sacrifices; namely, the pardon of their Sins, and perfect peace and reconciliation with God.

For these Ends and Reasons, and perhaps for many more as great and

con-

considerable as these which our shallow understandings are not able to fathom, the Wisdom of God hath pitched upon this way and method of delivering Mankind from the guilt and dominion of Sin by the Sacrifice of his Son. And to this end it was requisite that he should appear in our Nature and dwell amongst us for some considerable time, that by a long course of the greatest Innocency and of the greatest Sufferings in our Nature he might be capable of making a perfect expiation of Sin.

So that *two* things were requisite to qualify him for this purpose; perfect *Innocency* and *Obedience*, and great *Sufferings* in our *Nature*, even to the suffering of *Death*. Both these the *Scripture* declares to be necessary qualifications of a Person capable to make expiation of *Sin*; and both these were

were found in the Person of our
B. Saviour.

First, unsported *Innocency* and perfect *Obedience*. This the Scripture testifies concerning Him, and the whole course of his Life and actions. *He was in all points tempted like* Heb. 4. *as we are, yet without Sin,* saith the 15. *Apostle to the Hebrews.* *He always* Joh. 8. *did the things which pleased God,* as He 29. *testifies concerning himself,* and we are sure that his witness is true. *He did* 1 Pet. 2. *no sin, neither was guile found in his* 22. *mouth,* as St. Peter tells us of Him. And this was necessary to qualify him for the perfect expiation of Sin, whether we consider Him as a *Priest*, or as a *Sacrifice*.

As a *Priest*, he could not have been fit to make expiation for the Sins of others, had he not been without sin himself. And this the *Apostle* tells us is one great Advantage of our *High-Priest* under the *Gospel*,

Gospel, above the *High-Priest* under the *Law*, who being a Sinner himself, as well as those for whom he offer'd, had need to offer for himself before he could make so much as a Legal expiation for the Sins of others: But a perfect and effectual expiation of Sin, so as to purge the conscience from the guilt of it, cannot be made but by an *High Priest* who is holy and innocent himself;

Heb. 7. 26, 27. *For such an High-Priest*, saith the *Apostle*, *became us*, that is, now under the Dispensation of the *Gospel*, when a perfect expiation of Sins is to be made, *such an High-Priest* is necessary, *as is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from Sinners*, *who needs not as those High-Priests*, that is as the *High-Priests* under the *Law*, *to offer up sacrifice first for his own Sins, and then for the People*: The plain force of which Argument is this, that he who will be qualified to make atonement

ment for the Sins of others must be without sin himself.

And then if we consider *Christ* as a *Sacrifice* for *Sin*; perfect holiness is necessary to make a *Sacrifice* acceptable and available for the expiation of *Sin*. The necessity of this was typified by the quality of the *expiatory Sacrifices* under the *Law*: the *Beasts* that were to be offered were to be *without spot and blemish*: To which the *Apostle* alludes, speaking of the quality and efficacy of the *Sacrifice of Christ*: *How much* Heb. 9. *more*, says he, *shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?* And to the same purpose St. Peter, *Forasmuch as ye know ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot, &c; hereby* 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

intimating, that nothing less than the perfect innocence and holiness of him who was to be a Sacrifice for us could have expiated the guilt of our sins and purchased eternal Redemption for us.

Secondly, great *Sufferings* likewise in our Nature, even to the suffering of Death, were requisite to the perfect expiation of Sin: I say, even to the suffering of Death. For the Sacrifices which were to make expiation were to be slain. And it was a constant *Maxime* and Principle among the *Jews*, and the *Apostle* more than once in this *Epistle* seems to allow and confirm it, that *without shedding of blood there was no remission of Sins*.

Not that God could not have pardoned Sin without satisfaction made to his Justice, either by the suffering of the Sinner himself, or of a Sacrifice in his stead: But, according

ing to the method and Dispensation which the Wisdom of God had pitched upon, he was resolved not to dispense Forgiveness in any other way. For which reason he seems either to have possess'd Mankind with this *Principle*, or to have permitted them to be so perswaded, that *Sin was not to be expiated but by Blood*, that is, either by the Death of the Sinner, or of the Sacrifice.

Now the Life of our *B. Saviour*, as well as his Death, was made up of Sufferings of one kind or other: Continual Sufferings from his Cradle to his Cross, from the time he drew his first breath to his giving up of the ghost: And not only continual Sufferings, but the greatest that ever were, considering the Dignity of the Person that suffered, and the nature of the Sufferings: Considering likewise that these Sufferings were not only wholly undeserved

on his part, but unmerited also on ours, for whose sake he submitted himself to them : Nay, on the contrary, he had obliged to the utmost those for whom and by whom he suffered, and continued still to oblige them by the greatest Blessings and Benefits purchased and procured for them by those very Sufferings which with so much Malice and Cruelty they inflicted on him.

Had our *B. Saviour* been a mere Man, the perfect Innocency and unspotted Purity of his whole Life; his Zeal to do the Will of God, and his delight in doing it; his infinite pains and unwearied diligence in *going about doing good*: His constant Obedience to God in the most difficult Instances, and his perseverance in well doing, notwithstanding the ill usage and hard measure, the bitter Reproaches and Persecutions he met withal for it, from a wicked and ill

ill natured World : His perfect submission to the Will of God, his invincible Patience under the greatest and bitterest Sufferings, and his infinite Charity to his Enemies and Persecutors : These must needs be highly acceptable to God, and if Man could merit of God, likely enough to be available for the Sins of others.

But our Saviour and our Sacrifice being the *Son of God* in our Nature ; and He voluntarily assuming it, and submitting to the condition of Humanity in its lowest and most miserable state, Sin only excepted ; and his being contented to live a Life of doing good and suffering evil, and at last to be put to Death and slain a Sacrifice for us : The Dignity of the Person who did and suffered all this for us, and his dearness to God, must needs add a mighty value to so perfect an Obedience

and such patient Sufferings; so as to render them a full, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World.

And all this being willingly performed in our Nature, and accepted by God as done upon our account, may reasonably be presumed to redound to our benefit and advantage, as much as if we our selves had performed it in our own persons: Nothing being so proper, and so available to make an honourable *amends* and satisfaction to the Justice of God for the Sins of all Mankind, as the voluntary Obedience and Sufferings of Human Nature in a Person of so great Dignity and dearness to God as his eternal and entirely beloved Son.

Now that Expiation of Sin was made by the Sufferings of *Christ* in our

our stead, I shall endeavour to make good these *three* ways.

First, from plain Testimonies of *H. Scripture*, declaring this matter to us as clearly and fully as it is possible for words to do it.

Secondly, from the nature and intention of *Expiatory Sacrifices*, both among the *Jews* and *Heathen*; to which the Death of *Christ* is in the *New Testament* so frequently compared, and in point of virtue and efficacy to take away *Sin* infinitely preferred to it.

Thirdly, by vindicating this Method and Dispensation of the Divine Wisdom from the Objections which are brought against it; and by shewing that there is nothing in it that is unreasonable, or any wise unworthy of *God*.

I. I shall produce some plain Testimonies of *H. Scripture* which

declare this matter as clearly and fully as it is possible for words to do it ; namely , that the Son of God, in order to the effectual *Expiation* of Sin, suffered in our stead, and bore the wrath of God for us, and made a perfect Atonement for Sin, and obtained eternal Redemption for us.

This the Scripture declares to us in great variety of expressions ; as, that *Christ dyed for us*, and for our *Sins* ; that he was a *Sacrifice for us*, and a *propitiation for the Sins of the whole World*, that is , of all Mankind ; that he *bare our Sins in his own body on the Tree*, and *appeared to take away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself* ; that *we are justified in his blood*, and *redeemed by the price of it* ; and in very many other expressions to the same purpose.

And this is so evidently the scope and meaning of these Expressions, that it cannot be denied without offering

offering the greatest violence imaginable to the *H. Scriptures*. For can any man think that God would have used so many expressions in *Scripture*, the plain and most obvious sense of all which is that the *Son of God* suffered for our Sins and in our stead, if this had not been his design and meaning? Would not this be in effect to say, that God hath written a great Book to puzzle and confound, but not to instruct and teach Mankind?

I will at present single out some few of those many *Texts of Scripture* which might be produced to this purpose: *He hath made him to be sin* ^{2 Cor. 5.} *for us, who knew no sin*, that is, he hath made him who had no sin himself a Sacrifice for our sins. Again; *and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us and given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God*. St. Peter ^{Eph. 5. 10.} ^{1 Pet. 1. 18.} to the same purpose tells us, that

Christ

Christ also hath once suffered for Sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh: Here Christ is said to have suffered for Sin; and to declare that the Apostle did not only mean that Christ suffered upon the occasion of our Sins, but that he suffered in the place and stead of the Sinner, he adds, the just for the unjust, that is, the Son of God, who was innocent and had no Sin, suffered for us who were Sinners; or as it is elsewhere express'd, he bare our sins in his own body on the Tree.

It is true indeed, that Christ suffered for our benefit and advantage; which the Socinians would have to be all that is meant in the Texts which I have cited: But then it ought to be considered, that Christ's suffering for our benefit and advantage does by no means exclude, nor is any wise inconsistent with his suffering

ing in our stead. For whoever suffers in another man's stead, and to save him from suffering, does undoubtedly suffer for his benefit and advantage, and gives the best demonstration of it that can be: But the manner of the expression, if compared with other parallel *Texts* of *Scripture*, and especially with what is so often said of our *Saviour's* being a *Sacrifice*, which I shall have occasion further to urge by and by: I say the manner of the expression, if well considered, will appear to any man that is not contentious to signify our *Saviour's* suffering instead of the *Sinner*.

But not to argue from words and phrases, I will produce two *Texts* which declare this matter so plainly, that the force of them is not to be avoided without the most shameful wresting and perverting of them. *This is my Commandment*, says our ^{Joh. 15.} *Saviour*, ^{12.}

Saviour, that you love one another, as I have loved you. How is that? he declares in the next words, *Greater love than this hath no man, that a man lay down his life for his friend*, that is, that he be contented to die in his stead. And to the same purpose St. Paul, *For when ye were yet sinners in due time Christ died for the ungodly*: Now the question is, whether by this expression of Christ's dying for the ungodly be meant only his dying for the benefit and advantage of Sinners, but not his dying in their stead? This, let the words which immediately follow determine: *For scarcely for a righteous man will one dye, yet peradventure for a good man one would even dare to dye: But God commendeth his love to us, in that whilst we were yet sinners Christ dyed for us.* And now I appeal to any man of good sense, whether it be not plain that the Apostle here speaks of Christ's dying

dying for sinners in the same sense as one man is said to dye for another, that is, to save another from death ; which what is it else but to dye in his stead ? He that can deny this, is perverse to the highest degree, and I fear almost beyond the possibility of being convinced.

And the Argument from these two Texts is so much the stronger, because we do not here reason merely from the phrase and expression, but from the main Scope of our Saviour's discourse in the one, and of St. Paul's in the other. For the design of both is to recommend the Superlative love of Christ to us above the greatest love that ever any man express'd to another. The highest pitch that human affection did ever rise to, was for a man to lay down his life for his Friend ; but the Son of God laid down his life for his Enemies. *Scarcely, says St. Paul,*

Paul, would one lay down his life for a righteous man, that is, for one who is but strictly just and honest, and does no body wrong ; but for a good man, that is, for one that is kind and beneficial to all, and hath obliged Mankind by great Benefits; some one may be found that would lay down his life to save the life of such a Person : But the love of Christ hath gone far beyond this : He dyed for Sinners, for those who were neither good men nor righteous : But God commendeth his love to us, in that whilst we were yet Sinners Christ dyed for us. Now where doth the force of this Argument lye, if not in this ? that Christ hath done that for us, who were Enemies and Sinners, which some very few persons in the World have done for their Friend, or for some very eminently good man : And what is that ? Why they have laid down their lives in their stead : And

so *Christ* hath done for us. This seems to be so very plain, that I do not see how the force of this Argument is possible to be avoided.

It is evident then from *Scripture*, that *Christ* dyed not only for our advantage but in our stead ; as truly and really as any man ever did or can dye for another who lays down his own life to save another from death. For if *Christ* had not dyed, we had perished everlastinglly ; and because he dyed, we are saved from eternal Death and misery.

And though this be no where in *Scripture* spoken of by the name or term of *Satisfaction*, yet it is said to be the price of our *Redemption* ; which surely is the same thing in effect with *Satisfaction*. For as we are Sinners we are liable, and, as I may say, indebted to the Justice of God : And the Son of God, by his Death and Sufferings in our Nature, hath

hath discharged this obligation and paid this debt for us : Which discharge since it was obtained for us by the shedding of Christ's blood, and the Scripture tells us that *without shedding of blood there is no remission of Sins* : And since God is graciously pleased to accept of it for the Debt which we owed to his Justice, and to declare himself fully pleased and contented with it, why it may not properly enough be called *payment or satisfaction* I confess I am not able to understand. Men may eternally wrangle about any thing, but what a frivolous contention, what a trifling in serious matters, what *barretrie* in *Divinity* is this ?

Not that God was *angry* with his *Son*, when he thus *laid on him the ini-
quities of us all*: No he was always well pleased with him ; and never better, than when he *became obedient to the Death, even the Death of the Cross*, and

and bore our Sins in his own body on the Tree.

Nor yet that our Saviour suffered the very same that the Sinner should have suffered, namely, the proper Pains and Torment of the Damned: But that his Obedience and Sufferings were of that value and esteem with God, and his voluntary Sacrifice of himself so well-pleasing to him, that he thereupon entered into a Covenant of Grace and Mercy with Mankind, wherein he hath engaged himself to forgive the Sins of those who believe and repent, and to make them partakers of eternal life. And hence the *Blood of Christ* which was shed for us upon the *Cross* is called the *Blood of the Covenant*, as being the *Sanction* of that *New Covenant*, into which God is entered with Mankind: and not only the *Sanction* and confirmation of that *Covenant*, but the very *Foundation* of

it: For which reason the *Cup* in the *Lord's Supper* is called the *New Testament*, or, as the word should rather be rendred, the *New Covenant in his Blood, which was shed for many for the remission of Sins.* I proceed now to the

II^d. Thing propounded, which was to shew that the Expiation of our Sins was made by the Sufferings of Christ, from the *nature* and *intention* of *Expiatory Sacrifices*, both among the *Jews* and *Heathen*; to which the *Death of Christ* is in the *New Testament* so frequently compared, and in point of vertue and efficacy to take away Sin infinitely prefer'd to it.

Now the nature and design of *Expiatory Sacrifices* was plainly this: To substitute one *Living Creature* to suffer and die instead of another; so that what the Sinner deserved to have

have suffered was supposed to be done to the Sacrifice, that is, it was slain to make an atonement for the Sinner.

And though there was no reason to hope for any such effect from the Blood of *Bulls*, or *Goats*, or of any other *Living Creatures* that were wont to be offered up in Sacrifice; yet that both *Jews* and *Heathen* did expect and hope for it, is so very evident, that it cannot without extreme Ignorance or Obstinacy be deny'd.

But this expectation, how unreasonable soever, plainly shews it to have been the common Apprehension of Mankind, in all Ages, that God would not be appeased, nor should Sin be pardoned without Suffering: But yet so that men generally conceived good hopes that upon the Repentance of Sinners God would accept of a *vicarious punishment*,

ment, that is, of the Suffering of some other in their stead. And very probably, as I said before, in compliance with this Apprehension of Mankind, and in condescension to it, as well as for other weighty Reasons best known to the Divine Wisdom, God was pleased to find out such a Sacrifice as should really and effectually procure for them that great Blessing of the Forgiveness of Sins, which they had so long hoped for from the multitude of their own Sacrifices.

And the *Apostle* to the *Hebrews* doth in a large Discourse shew the great virtue and efficacy of the Sacrifice of *Christ*, to the purpose of Remission of Sins, above that of the Sacrifices under the Law: And that the Death of *Christ* is really and effectually to our advantage all that which the Sacrifices under the Law were supposed to be to the Sinner: *But now once*, saith

saith the *Apostle* here in the *Text*, in the end of the *World*, hath he appeared to take away *Sin* by the *Sacrifice* of himself. This is the great vertue and efficacy of the *Sacrifice* of *Christ*, that what ever was expected from any other *Sacrifices*, either by *Jews* or *Heathens*, was really effected by this.

This was plainly signified by the *Jewish Passover*, wherein the *Lamb* was slain, and the *Sinner* did *escape* and was *pass'd* by. In allusion where-to St. *Paul* makes no scruple to call *Christ* our *Passover* or *Paschal Lamb*, who was *slain* that we might *escape*: *Christ* our *Passover*, says he, is *slain* or ^{1 Cor. 5.} *offer'd* for us; that is, He by the gracious appointment of God was substituted to suffer all that in our stead which the *Paschal Lamb* was supposed to suffer for the *Sinner*.

And this was likewise signified by the *Sinners* laying his hand upon the *Sacrifice* that was to be slain,

thereby as it were transferring the punishment which was due to himself upon the Sacrifice that was to be slain and offered up. For so God tells *Moses*, that the Sinner, who came to offer an Expiatory Sacrifice, **Lev. 1. 4.** should do : *He shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him, to make an Atonement for him.* And the *Apostle* tells us, that it was an established Principle in the *Jewish Religion*, that without shedding of blood there was no *Remission of Sins*: Which plainly shews that they expected this Benefit of the Remission of Sins, from the Blood of their Sacrifices.

And then he tells us, that we are really made partakers of this Benefit by the Blood of *Christ*, and by the virtue of his Sacrifice : And again, **Heb. 9. 28.** *Christ*, says he, *was once offered to bear the Sins of many*; plainly alluding to the Sacrifices under the Law, which did,

did, as it were, bear the faults of the Sinner.

And that this expression, of *Christ's* being *offered to bear our Sins*, cannot be meant of his taking away our Sins by his holy *Doctrine* which was confirmed by his *Death*, but of his bearing our Sins by way of *imputation*, and by his suffering for them in our stead, as the *Sacrifice* was supposed to do for the Sinner ; This, I say, is evident beyond all denial from the opposition which follows, after the *Text*, between his *first Appearance* and his *second* ; *Christ*, says our *Apostle*, *was once offered to bear our Sins*, v. 28. *but unto them that look for him he shall appear a second time without Sin unto Salvation*. Why ? Did he not appear the first time without Sin ? Yes certainly, as to any inherent guilt ; for the *Scripture* tells us *he had no Sin*. What then is the meaning of the opposition, That at his *first Coming*

he bore our Sins, but at his second Coming he shall appear without Sin unto Salvation? These words can have no other imaginable sense but this, that at his first Coming he sustain'd the Person of a Sinner and suffered instead of us; but his second Coming shall be upon another account, and he shall appear without Sin unto Salvation, that is, not as a Sacrifice, but as a Judge to confer the Reward of Eternal Life upon those who are partakers of the benefit of that Sacrifice which he offered to God for us in the days of his Flesh. I proceed to the

III.

III^d. Thing I proposed, and which yet remains to be spoken to; namely, to vindicate this Method and Dispensation of the Divine Wisdom from the Objections which are brought against it; and to shew that there is nothing in it that is unreasonable

sonable, or any wise unworthy of God. I shall mention four *Objections* which are commonly urged in this matter, and I think they are all that are considerable.

First, That this Method, of the Expiation of Sin by the Sufferings of Christ, seems to argue some defect and want of Goodness in God, as if he needed some external Motive and were not of himself disposed to forgive Sinners.

To which I think the *Answer* is not difficult, namely, that God did not want Goodness to have forgiven Sin freely and without any Satisfaction, but his Wisdom did not think it meet to give encouragement to Sin by too easy a forgiveness, and without some remarkable testimony of his severe displeasure against it: And therefore his greater Goodness and Compassion to Mankind devised this way to save the Sinner, without giving

giving the least countenance and encouragement to Sin.

For God to think of saving us any way, was excessive Goodness and Mercy ; but to think of doing it in this way, by substituting his dearly beloved Son to suffer in our stead, is a Condescension so very amazing, that if God had not been pleased of his own Goodness to stoop to it, it had almost been Blasphemy in Man to have thought of it, or desired it.

Obj. 2d. **Secondly**, How can our Sins be said to have been forgiven *freely*, if the Pardon of them was purchased at so dear a rate and so mighty a Price was paid for it ?

In *Answer* to this I desire these *two* things may be considered. *1st.* That it is a wonderful grace and favour of God to admit of this translation of the Punishment which was due to us, and to accept of the Suffer-

Sufferings of another in our stead, and for our benefit ; when he might justly have exacted it of us in our own Persons : So that, even in this respect, we are, as St. Paul says, *justified freely by his grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ* : And freely too in respect of any necessity that lay upon God to forgive us in this or any other way. It was a free act of his Goodness to save us, even by the Satisfaction and Sufferings of his own Son. *2ly.* It was in effect freely too, notwithstanding the mighty Price which was paid for our Redemption. Because this Price was not of our own procuring, but of God's providing ; He *found out this Ransome for us.* And will any man say , that a Prince who prevails with his Son to intercede for the Pardon of a Rebel, yea and to suffer some punishment or to pay a Fine for the obtaining of it, does not

not in effect and in all equitable and grateful construction forgive him freely?

Obj. 3d. *Thirdly,* It is yet further objected, That this seems to be more unreasonable than the sacrificing of *Beasts* among the *Jews*, nay than the sacrificing of *Men* among the *Heathen*, and even of their own *Sons and Daughters*: Because this is the offering up of the *Son of God*, the most innocent and the most excellent Person that ever was.

To which I answer, that if we consider the *manner*, and the *design* of it, the thing will appear to be quite otherwise.

As to the *manner* of it, God did not command his Son to be sacrificed, but his Providence permitted the wickedness and violence of men to put him to death: And then his Goodness and Wisdom did over-rule this worst of Actions to the

the best of Ends. And if we consider the matter aright, how is this any more a reflection upon the Holy Providence of God, than any Enormities and Guelties which by his permission are daily committed in the World?

And then if we consider the End and *Design* of this permission of Christ's Death, and the application of it to the purpose of a general Expiation ; we cannot but acknowledge, and even adore the gracious and mercifull Design of it. For by this means God did at once put an end to that unreasonable and bloody way of Worship, which had been so long practiced in the World : And after this one Sacrifice, which was so infinitely dear to God, the benefit of Expiation was not to be expected in any other way ; all other Sacrifices being worthless and vain in comparison of this : And it hath ever since obtained

obtained this effect, of making all other Sacrifices to cease, in all Parts of the World where Christianity hath prevailed.

Obj. 4th. *Fourthly,* The last *Objection* is, the Injustice and Cruelty of an innocent Person's suffering instead of the Offender.

To this I answer, That they who make so great a noise with this *Objection* do seem to me to give a full and clear *Answer* to it themselves, by acknowledging, as they constantly and expressly do, that our *Saviour* suffered all this for our *benefit* and *advantage*, though not in our *place* and *stead*. For this, to my apprehension, is plainly to give up the *Cause*, unless they can shew a good reason why there is not as much Injustice and Cruelty in an innocent Person's suffering for the benefit and advantage of a *Malefactor*, as in his suffering in his *stead*: So little do Men,

in

in the heat of dispute and opposition, who are resolved to hold fast an Opinion in despite of Reason and good sense, consider, that they do many times in effect, and by necessary consequence, grant the very thing which in express terms they do so stiffly and pertinaciously deny.

The truth of the matter is this; there is nothing of Injustice or Cruelty in either Case; neither in an Innocent Person's suffering for the *benefit* of an Offender, nor in his *stead*; supposing the Suffering to be voluntary: But they have equally the same appearance of Injustice and Cruelty: Nor can I possibly discern any reason why Injustice and Cruelty should be objected in the one Case more than in the other, there being every whit as little reason why an *Innocent Person* should suffer for the *benefit* of a *Criminal*, as why he should suffer in his *stead*. So that I
hope

hope this *Objection*, which above all the rest hath been so loudly and so invidiously urged, hath received a just *Answer*.

And I believe, if the matter were searched to the bottom, all this perverse contention, about our Saviour's suffering for our *benefit* but not in our *stead*, will signify just nothing. For if *Christ* dyed for our *benefit* so as some way or other, by virtue of his Death and Sufferings, to save us from the wrath of God and to procure our escape from eternal Death, this, for ought I know, is all that any body means by his dying in our *stead*. For he that dies with an intention to do that *benefit* to another as to save him from Death, doth certainly to all intents and purposes dye in his place and *stead*.

And if they will grant this to be their meaning, the Controversie is at an end; and both sides are agreed in the

they will give up that which by their own confession is an *undoubted Article* of the *Christian Faith* and not contro-
verted on either Side ; except on-
ly by the *Socinians*, who yet are hear-
ty Enemies to *Transubstantiation*, and
have exposed the absurdity of it
with great advantage.

But I shall endeavour to return a
more particular *Answer* to this *Ob-
jection* ; and such a one as I hope
will satisfy every considerate and un-
prejudiced mind, that after all this
confidence and swaggering of theirs
there is by no means equal reason
either for the *receiving* or for the *re-
jecting* of these *two Doctrines* of the
Trinity and *Transubstantiation*.

First, There is not equal reason
for the *belief* of these *Two Doctrines*.
This *Objection*, if it be of any force,
must suppose that there is equal evi-
dence and proof from *Scripture* for
these *two Doctrines* : But this we ut-
terly

D

terly deny, and with great reason ; because it is no more evident from the words of *Scripture* that the *Sacramental Bread* is substantially changed into *Christ's natural Body* by virtue of those words, *This is my Body*, than it is that *Christ* is substantially changed into a *natural Vine* by virtue of those words, *I am the true Vine* ; or than that the *Rock* in the *Wilderness*, of which the *Israelites* drank, was substantially changed into the *Person of Christ*, because it is expressly said, *That Rock was Christ* ; or than that the *Christian Church* is substantially changed into the *natural Body of Christ*, because it is in express terms said of the *Church*, *That it is his Body*.

Eph. 1.

23.

But besides this, several of their own most learned *Writers* have freely acknowledged, that *Transubstantiation* can neither be directly proved, nor necessarily concluded from *Scri-*

pture :

pture: But this the *Writers* of the *Christian Church* did never acknowledge concerning the *Trinity*, and the *Divinity of Christ*; but have always appealed to the clear and undeniable *Testimonies of Scripture* for the *Proof* of these *Doctrines*. And then the whole force of the *Objection* amounts to this, that if I am bound to believe what I am sure God says, tho I cannot comprehend it; then I am bound by the same reason to believe the greatest *Absurdity* in the *World*, though I have no manner of assurance of any *Divine Revelation* concerning it. And if this be their meaning, though we understand not *Transubstantiation*, yet we very well understand what they would have, but cannot grant it; because there is not equal reason to believe *two* things, for *one* of which there is good proof, and for the other no proof at all.

D 2 *Secondly*,

Secondly, neither is there equal reason for the *rejecting* of these two *Doctrines*. This the Objection supposes, which yet cannot be supposed but upon one or both of these two grounds: Either because these two *Doctrines* are equally *incomprehensible*, or because they are equally loaded with *Absurdities* and *Contradictions*.

The *First* is no good ground of *rejecting* any *Doctrine*, merely because it is *incomprehensible*; as I have abundantly shew'd already. But besides this, there is a wide difference between plain matters of *Sense*, and *Mysteries* concerning God; and it does by no means follow that, if a man do once admit any thing concerning God which he cannot *comprehend*, he hath no reason afterwards to believe what he himself *sees*. This is a most unreasonable and destructive way of arguing, because

cause it strikes at the foundation of all Certainty, and sets every man at liberty to deny the most plain and evident *Truths of Christianity*, if he may not be humor'd in having the absurdest things in the World admitted for true. The next step will be to persuade us that we may as well deny the Being of *God* because his Nature is *incomprehensible* by our *Reason*, as deny *Transubstantiation* because it evidently contradicts our *Senses*.

z dly. Nor are these *two Doctrines* loaded with the like *Absurdities* and *Contradictions* : So far from this, that the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, as it is delivered in the *Scriptures*, and hath already been explained, hath no *Absurdity* or *Contradiction* either involved in it, or necessarily consequent upon it : But the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* is big with all imaginable *Absurdity* and

Contradiction. And their own *Schoolmen* have sufficiently exposed it; especially *Scotus*, and he designed to do so, as any man that attentively reads him may plainly discover: For in his *Disputation* about it he treats this *Doctrine* with the greatest contempt, as a new Invention of the Council of *Lateran* under Pope *Innocent III.* To the *Decree* of which *Council* concerning it he seems to pay a formal submission, but really despises it as contrary to the common *Sense* and *Reason* of Mankind, and not at all supported by *Scripture*; as any one may easily discern that will carefully consider his manner of handling it and the result of his whole *Disputation* about it.

And now Suppose there were some appearance of Absurdity and **Contradiction** in the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* as it is delivered in *Scripture*, must we therefore believe a *Doctrine*

ctrine which is not at all revealed in *Scripture*, and which hath certainly in it all the *absurdities* in the World, and all the *Contradictions* to *Sense* and *Reason*; and which once admitted, doth at once destroy all Certainty, Yes, say they, why not? since we of the *Church of Rome* are satisfied that this *Doctrine* is revealed in *Scripture*; or, if it be not, is defined by the *Church*, which is every whit as good. But is this equal, to demand of us the belief of a thing which hath always been controverted, not only between *us* and *them*, but even among themselves, at least till the *Council of Trent*? And this upon such unreasonable terms, that we must either yield this *Point* to them or else renounce a *Doctrine* agreed on both Sides to be revealed in *Scripture*.

To shew the unreasonableness of this proceeding, Let us suppose a *Priest* of the Church of *Rome* pressing a *Jew* or *Turk* to the belief of *Transubstantiation*, and because one kindness deserves another, the *Jew* or *Turk* should demand of him the belief of all the *Fables* in the *Talmud*, or in the *Alchoran*; since none of these, nor indeed all of them together, are near so absurd as *Transubstantiation*: Would not this be much more reasonable and equal than what they demand of us? Since no Absurdity, how monstrous and big-soever, can be thought of, which may not enter into an Understanding in which a Breach hath been already made wide enough to admit *Transubstantiation*. The Priests of *Baal* did not half so much deserve to be exposed by the *Prophet* for their Superstition and folly, as the Priests of the Church of *Rome* do for

for this sensless and stupid *Doctrine* of theirs with a *hard Name*. I shall only add this one thing more, That if this *Doctrine* were possible to be true, and clearly prov'd to be so; yet it would be evidently useless and to no purpose. For it pretends to change the substance of one thing into the substance of another thing that is already and before this change is pretended to be made. But to what purpose? Not to make the *Body* of Christ, for that was already in Being; and the Substance of the *Bread* is lost, nothing of it remaineth but the *Accidents* which are good for nothing, and indeed are nothing when the Substance is destroy'd and gone.

All that now remains is to make some practical *Inferences* from this *Doctrine* of the *Unity* of the *Divine Nature*. And they shall be the same which

which God himself makes by *Moses*,
Deut. 6. which *Text* also is cited by our *Sa-*
4. *viour*, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy*
Mark. *God is one Lord*; *and thou shalt love the*
12. 29. *Lord thy God with all thine heart, and*
30, 31. *with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,*
and with all thy strength: And thou
shalt love thy neighbour as thy self. So
that according to our *Saviour* the
whole *Duty of Man*, the *love of*
God and of our neighbour is founded in
the *Unity of the Divine Nature*.

I. *The love of God; The Lord thy*
God is One Lord, therefore *thou shalt*
love Him with all thy heart, &c. this is
the *first and great Commandment*: And
it comprehends in it all the *Duties of*
the *first Table* as naturally flowing
from it. As that we should *serve*
him only, and pay no *Religious Worship*
to any but to *Him*. For to pay *Re-*
ligious Worship to any thing is to make
it *a God* and to acknowledge it for
such:

such: And therefore God being but *One* we can give *Religious Worship* to none but to *Him* only. And among all the parts of *Religious Worship* none is more peculiarly appropriated to the *Deity* than *solemn Invocation* and *Prayer*. For he to whom men address their Requests, at all times, and in all places, must be supposed to be always every where present, to understand all our desires and wants, and to be able to supply them; and this God only is, and can do.

So likewise from the *Unity* of the *Divine Nature* may be inferr'd, that we should not worship God by any *sensible Image* or *Representation*: Because God being a *singular Being* there is nothing like *Him*, or that can without injuring and debasing his most *spiritual* and *perfect* and *im-
mense Being* be compared to *Him*: As *He* himself speaks in the *Pro-
phet*,

Isa. 46.5. *phet, To whom will ye liken me, saith the Lord, and make me equal?* And therefore with no *Distinction* whatsoever can it be lawful to give *Religious Worship*, or any part of it, to any but *God*: We can *pray* to none but to *Him*, because *He* only is every where present, and *only* knows the *Hearts* of all the *children* of *men*; which *Solomon* gives as the reason why we should address our *Supplications* to *God* only, *who dwelleth in the Heavens*.

1 Kings 8. 39. So that the Reason of these *two Precepts* is founded in the *Unity* and *Singularity* of the *Divine Nature*, and unless there be more *Gods* than *One*, we must *worship Him only*, and *pray* to none but *Him*: Because we can give *Invocation* to none but to *Him only* whom we believe to be *God*; as **Rom. 10. 14.** St. *Paul* reasons, *How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed?*

II. The love likewise of our Neighbour is founded in the Unity of the Divine Nature, and may be infer'd from it: *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One Lord, therefore thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy self.* And the Apostle gives this reason why Christians should be at unity among themselves; *There is One God and Father of all,* and therefore we should *keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace,* that is, live in mutual love and peace. The Prophet likewise assigns this reason why all Mankind should be upon good terms with one another, and not be injurious one to another, *Have we not all One Father? Mal. 2. 10. hath not One God created us? Why do we then deal treacherously every man against his brother.*

And therefore when we see such hatred and enmity among Men, such divisions and animosities among Christians, we may not only ask St. Paul's

St. Paul's question, *Is Christ divided?* that we cannot agree about serving him; either all to serve him in one way, or to bear with one another in our differences: I say we may not only ask St. Paul's question, *Is Christ divided?* but may ask further, *Is God divided?* Is there not *One God*, and are we not all his *Offspring*? Are we not all the Sons of *Adam*, *who was the Son of God*? So that if we trace our selves to our *Original*, we shall find a great nearness and equality among men: And this equality that we are all God's *creatures* and *Image*, and that the *One only God* is the *Father of us all*, is a more real ground of mutual *love*, and *peace*, and *equity* in our dealings one with another, than any of those petty differences and distinctions of *strong* and *weak*, of *rich* and *poor*, of *wise* and *foolish*, of *base* and *honourable*, can be to encourage men to any thing of *insolence*,

in-

injustice, and inequality of dealing one towards another. Because that wherein we all agree, that we are the *Creatures* and *Children of God* and have all *One common Father*, is essential and constant ; but those things wherein we differ are accidental and mutable, and happen to one another by turns.

Thus much may suffice to have spoken concerning the *first Proposition* in the *Text*, *There is one God : To Him, Father, Son, and H. Ghost be all Honour and Glory, Dominion and Power, now and for ever.*
Amen.

F I N I S.